

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/937,460

Applicant(s)

KOOPMAN, PIETER TJERK

Examiner

Shawn S. An

Art Unit

2621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shawn S. An.

(3)_____.

(2) Ryan Miller.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 26 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bacus (all three cited references).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


SHAWN AN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We have discussed a difference between the claimed "an object holder" and "a displaceable mirror" with respect to the Applicant's invention. Applicant's representative argued that x-y table in the Bacus reference can't be considered an object holder that holds the object in a stationary position as required by the claim. Examiner believes after controlling x-y controllers, it is subsequently in a stationary position, thus the object holder takes stationary form. With regard to the displaceable mirror, the Applicant's representative argued that the mirror (170) of the third Bacus reference is only displaceable during calibration, and not for selecting part of the image. However, the Examiner disagrees based on a case of obviousness.



SHANNAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER